



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XI. — *The Priapea and the Vergilian Appendix*

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT S. RADFORD

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I. Introduction. 'Impersonations' of Tibullus.

Versus Ovidii Nasonis

It is the purpose of the present article to investigate the authorship of the great *Priapea*¹ and its relation to the Vergilian Appendix. The *Priapea* is an Augustan collection of eighty elegant and witty, but jocose and licentious poems in honor of Priapus, which have come down to us in the manuscripts under the name of Vergil, and which, according to the ancient testimony, have formed from the first an integral part of the Appendix. With such clear and definite attestation, the collection necessarily found a place in nearly all the early editions of Vergil of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, beginning with the *princeps* of 1469, though the objectionable character of the contents led many of the learned editors to omit or to change the ascription. As regards the Appendix itself, it is well known that editors and critics have been agreed for centuries that few, if any, works contained in it can be justly ascribed to Vergil. In recent years, however, Friedrich Vollmer, the latest editor of the Appendix, has undertaken, in a very confident manner, in his well-known article published in the *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.*, 1907, pp. 335-374, to set aside the almost unanimous judgment of scholars,² and has wished to maintain, on the basis of

¹ There is only one great *Priapea*, and this is to be carefully distinguished from any casual or dispersed poems upon Priapus — such as the three pieces at the head of the *Catalepton* (*Cat.* I-III) or Martial's scattered epigrams (VI, 16. 49. 72. 73; VII, 91) — which, without the least vestige of ancient or manuscript authority, have sometimes been given the title of *Priapea* by the moderns, often with the express purpose of minimizing the great *Priapea* and obscuring its unique position; cf. Birt in his edition of the *Catalepton* (Leipzig, 1910), p. 2.

² He himself writes (*op. cit.* 332): "The universal opinion today rejects all the poems of the Appendix, with the exception of a few pieces of the *Catalep-*

external evidence alone, that the Appendix contains the genuine youthful works of Vergil. No one will deny that Vollmer is an admirable textual critic and a most trustworthy and capable editor, but on complex literary questions his judgment — expressed in a singularly hasty and fragmentary study — seems to the present writer of little weight in comparison with that of Naeke, Ribbeck, Baehrens, L. Müller, Buecheler, Leo, Munro, and Ellis. It must be admitted, however, that his work has appeared at a most propitious moment, and that his essentially emotional and wholly uncritical views have gained numerous adherents, who have ransacked every part of the Appendix in the search for supposed biographical data and have exulted lustily in the discovery of a 'new Vergil.' Strangely enough, in all this eager, yet, for the most part, quite superficial study, the great *Priapea* (which, *verecundiae causa*, has usually since 1573 been removed from the Appendix, and like the *Aetna*, been printed separately) has been entirely overlooked, and it seems desirable at the present time to remedy this grave and wellnigh fatal omission. Before we examine the *Priapea* in detail, however, it will be necessary to make a number of preliminary general observations both upon the Tibullan and the Vergilian Collections, and also briefly to review Vollmer's remarkable conclusions of 1907.

In my article on "The Juvenile Works of Ovid," published last year in *T.A.P.A.* LI, 146 ff., I refuted the long-accepted belief that Ovid composed only in dactyls and established the spondaic character of his early poems in a manner which, it is safe to say, will never be seriously called in question. Thus the youthful *Halieutica* shows 57.2% of spondees; the epilogue to the first book of the *Amores* (I, 15) shows in 21 hexameters 57.1%; in 81 hexameters the three poems, II, 4, III, 8 and 10, show 53.1%, etc. When, with the approval of his patron (*Pont.* II, 3, 75), he edited the Messalla Collection (*Tib.* II-IV), the spondees were still considerably pre-
ton." There is no adequate discussion of the views of his predecessors in Vollmer's article, only a constant neglect and ignoring of those views.

ponderant in his elegies. But there is a feature of this Collection which is much more striking and, to the modern mind, much more sensational than the metrical composition. I mean the three artistic 'imitations' or 'impersonations' of Tibullus, namely, elegies iv, 13 and ii, 3 and 5, in which the names of Tibullus and Nemesis are freely used without authorization, and which appear therefore at first sight to be actually written by Tibullus. We might therefore perhaps apply to them the term 'playful forgeries,' but in point of fact these three elegies are far from being gross and deliberate literary frauds, such as were perpetrated, for example, upon Shakspearean scholars with such notable success by William Henry Ireland in 1795-1796. They are rather dramatic and artistic impersonations of the sort that have been consecrated by the genius of Chatterton or the 'younger Anacreon' or the theosophical author of the Fourth Gospel, and such as well befit the author of the twenty-one Epistles of the Heroines and of the Sulpicia letters. The spurious character of iv, 13, which was perhaps first asserted by the learned English translator, James Grainger, in 1757, has since been perceived by very many critics, but it has been most fully and most acutely shown in our own day by Postgate, *Journal of Philology*, ix (1880), 280, and *Selections from Tibullus*, 191 ff. Postgate's final judgment (*Selections*, 198), in which he apologizes for having formerly denounced this beautiful piece as a common forgery, is most justly expressed, and is quite similar, in fact, to the conclusions of Grainger: "Some admirer of Tibullus . . . wrote it, we may conjecture, to amuse himself or his friends, and introduced the name of Tibullus simply to give an air of verisimilitude to the production." My forthcoming study of the language and metre of Book iv not only confirms at every point the results of Postgate's brilliant criticism, but also shows the unmistakably Ovidian origin of this elegy. The second or posthumous book contains two similar 'impersonations' of much greater extent and of a much more ambitious character, namely, ii, 5 and 3. Gruppe,

Röm. Elegie, 69-101, first — after Scaliger and Heyne — seriously attacked the problem of the great Messalinus or national elegy (II, 5), and with much ingenuity sought to solve the immense difficulties which it presents, by the hypothesis of enormous interpolations introduced into the piece after the death of Tibullus. His views were accepted in the main by a long line of well-known Tibullan scholars.³ It was reserved, however, for W. Wisser, in a very complete program (*Über Tibull*, II, 5, Eutin, 1874) to reach a correct solution of the problem. Limiting himself narrowly to the arrangement of the poem, Wisser showed that the composition throughout was immature and, in a technical sense, thoroughly bad.⁴ He correctly concluded therefore that the whole elegy was spurious. Wisser's work is an even more brilliant and convincing piece of criticism than Postgate's study of IV, 13, but it is wholly inadequate for present needs. My own study of this great elegy, which is necessarily an extended one, embracing language, metric, and mythology, shows the correctness of Wisser's conclusions and the Ovidian character of the whole poem.⁵ The elegy II, 3 is also a spondaic poem, but in my former article in the *Transactions* (p. 158) I still attributed it, *verecundiae causa*, to Tibullus, not wishing to seem overeager to despoil of his traditional works 'the poet who first brought Roman elegy to perfection,' and preferring therefore to err on the side of conservatism and caution. Even a moderate use, however, of indices and lexicons, such as was necessary in examining II, 5 and IV, 2-14, soon showed me how utterly impossible it was, both on the score of the

³ Enumerated by Hiller, *Tibullus*, xv; Ehrengreuber, *De panegyrico*, I, 13; Baehrens, *Tib. Blätter*, 24. Baehrens (p. 36) argues with some plausibility that the invocation of Apollo (Augustus) in vs. 79 refers to the events of 18 B.C. and was therefore composed subsequent to the death of Tibullus.

⁴ Although the poem, viewed as a whole, is one of the finest and most brilliant productions of Roman elegy, it is seen, when minutely examined, to be astoundingly weak in the development of its thought, and resembles nothing so much as the *Culex*, which proceeds from the same author.

⁵ Owing to other engagements, I cannot hope, however, to publish my study, nearly complete though it is, at once — perhaps not for two or three years.

language and the recondite Alexandrine mythology, any longer to ascribe this poem or any part of it to Tibullus. It is clear therefore that when Tibullus, always indifferent to literary fame, died suddenly in the same year as Vergil, 19 B.C., he left only three unpublished elegies (II, 1, 4, and 6), which constituted in all only two hundred and four verses and were far too few to form a poetical book of five hundred lines.⁶ Several years later,⁷ Ovid, the younger and much more gifted poet of the circle, was commissioned by Messalla to publish the master's scanty literary remains and was encouraged to add his own juvenile works.⁸ The Messalla Collection, which is the result of his labors, is the noblest tribute which a younger poet has ever paid to an older one; it is—with the exception of the Socratic dialogues of Plato—the most generous gift which a loving disciple has ever offered to the memory of a revered master. Surely Ovid might have well described his relation to his predecessor in the fine lines of Lucretius (II, 3 f.):

Inque tuis pono pressis vestigia signis,
Non ita certandi cupidus quam *propter amorem*
Quod te imitari aveo.

In truth, but for the copious additions so freely made by the youthful editor, we may well doubt whether the slender volume (*libellus*) of Tibullus would have long retained its fame or would have come down to posterity at all. The place which Tibullus has enjoyed in Roman literature, he owes largely then to the self-sacrificing devotion of Ovid, his greater disciple.⁹

⁶ See Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 286 ff., and Ullrich, *Studia Tib. De libri secundi edit.* (Berlin, 1889), 58 ff.

⁷ I no longer think that the second book was published in 19 B.C.; the whole Collection was issued perhaps about 15-14 B.C.

⁸ So at least we interpret *Pont.* II, 3, 75 ff. Many scholars have held that the publication could have taken place only after Messalla's death (cf. Schanz, *Röm. Lit.* § 278). Our favorable judgment of Ovid is based upon the *motive* which impelled him.

⁹ Gruppe, *op. cit.* 268, held that the Sulpicia elegies were the finest things in

As is well known, Ovid has constantly given expression in his works to the love and veneration which he felt for all the great poets of Rome and Alexandria.¹⁰ I may quote here from the Vergilian Appendix, by way of anticipation, still another example of Ovid's veneration for his great predecessors; it is a very striking illustration, yet one which has been misunderstood for centuries. In the Bembinus and other related manuscripts,¹¹ immediately following the *Vita Bernensis*, the actual Appendix begins not with the *Culex*, as is usually but erroneously assumed, but with the *Versus Ovidii Nasonis de Vergilio* (*Anth. Lat.* 1, 1-10 Riese). This poem is the preface to Ovid's monostich and decastich arguments to the twelve books of the *Aeneid*, 132 verses in all (*ib.* 1, 11-142), and in it Ovid apologizes humbly to his beloved Vergil for the liberty which he has taken in abridging the divine *Aeneid*:

Vergilius magno quantum concessit Homero,
Tantum ego Vergilio Naso poeta meo.
Nec me praelatum cupio tibi ferre, poeta:
Ingenio si te subsequor, hoc satis est.

.
Adfirmo gravitate mea, me carmine nullum
Livoris titulum praeposuisse tibi.

Since the Appendix was originally an anonymous work, it is not likely that these verses formerly preceded the *Culex* and opened the collection, but it is not improbable that both they and the tetrastich preface of Ovid to the arguments of

'Tibullus': "They are the very soul of poetry. . . . The whole Roman world has nothing similar to offer." Cf. also Schanz, *op. cit.* § 284, p. 238. Plessis also (*Poésie Lat.* 376) has written eloquently of the debt which Tibullus owes to the 'beautiful verses of Lygdamus.' In general the famous and oft-quoted verses of the Tibullan Corpus are not the lines of Tibullus at all, but those of Ovid.

¹⁰ *E.g.*, *Trist.* iv, 10, 41, colui fovique poetas, | quotque aderant vates, rebar adesse deos; *ib.* v, 3, 55, veterum digne veneror cum scripta virorum. See also the eloquent passage on Ovid's 'literary candor' in S. G. Owen's article "Ovid," *Ency. Brit.*¹¹ xx, 388.

¹¹ Sommer, *Catalepton* (Halle, 1910), p. 7; Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 31; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 11.

the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics*¹² stood among the lost *Epi-grammata*. It makes little difference that the critics of the sixteenth century, from whom our current views are derived, not knowing the relation of eager discipleship and of 'sedulous apery'¹³ which the youthful Ovid voluntarily assumed to all his great predecessors, too hastily pronounced the Ovidian prefaces and arguments spurious. They did not have before them the elaborate studies of Zingerle (*Ovid u. sein Verhältnis zu d. Vorgängern*, Innsbruck, 1869-1871) and of Ganzenmüller ("Aus Ovids Werkstatt," *Philologus*, LXX (1911), 274-311, 397-437), which reveal fully Ovid's extraordinary and almost unprecedented genius for imitation, nor had they read the violent and angry diatribes which Ehrenguber (*op. cit.* x, 71-75; II, 28; III, 80, etc.) and Némethy (*Ciris* [Budapest, 1909], pp. 6-24, 44) have poured forth against the unknown author of the *Panegyric* and the *Ciris* as 'the most vile, cunning, and contemptible of imitators,' 'the most shameless and insolent of plagiarists, plunderers, and freebooters,' 'the villainous ape of Lucretius, Catullus, and Vergil,' 'the upstart crow (*cornicula*),' etc.¹⁴ They could not know there-

¹² *Carmen tetrasticon Ovidii Nasonis* (*Qualis bucolicis, quantus tellure domanda*, etc.) *Anth. Lat.* 2, 1-4.

¹³ "I have played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt, to Lamb, to Wordsworth, to Defoe, etc. . . . That is the way to learn to write. . . . It was so Keats learned." — Robert Louis Stevenson in "A College Magazine," *Memories and Portraits*, p. 122, — the *locus classicus* in English literature on youthful imitation. See also Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in d. griech. Lit.*, Teubner, 1912, and the chapter on "The Classical Theory of Imitation" in Fiske's *Lucilius and Horace*, Madison, 1920. One can only regret that many of the writers upon the Tibullan and Vergilian Appendices seem so totally ignorant of certain phases of general literary history.

¹⁴ Cf. Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II, 354 (of the author of the *Ciris*), 'this diligent imitator and freebooter.' We might quote also for Némethy's benefit the invective of Lenaeus, the freedman of Pompey, against Sallust ("nebulonem popinonemque, et vita scriptisque monstrosum, praeterea priscorum Catonisque verborum ineruditissimum furem," Suet. *Gram.* 15) and Greene's well-known attack upon Shakspeare: "There is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers,—in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a Countrie." In truth it is now generally recognized that Shakspeare was much less original than Marlowe and Ben Jonson and, in some respects, less original than Beau-

fore that our poet esteemed it the highest privilege to perform even the most menial offices for Vergil and for Tibullus, and, seeking to follow everywhere closely in their footsteps, was content if he should be touched even by the faint and distant reflection of their fame.

I have therefore examined the prefaces (and metrical arguments) afresh with much care, and I find, for example, that they everywhere show — quite unlike the arguments of Sulpicius Apollinaris to the *Aeneid* — the masterly treatment of the penthemimeral caesura which appears in the *Lygdamus*, *Catalepton*, ix, *Ciris*, *Priapea*, etc., and which marks the consummate future artist. They have also most conspicuously the Ovidian phraseology, and the same is true of the arguments also, wherever the latter do not reproduce the original language of Vergil. Their genuineness is therefore fully attested by both external and internal evidence.

We may return for a moment to the Tibullan Appendix. We are struck by the fact that not only the Messalinus and Sulpicia elegies which were written expressly and solely for the Tibullan volume show the Tibullan form of the pentameter with dissyllabic close, but the same is true also of the *Lygdamus* poems which were originally composed independently. On the other hand, the elegies of the Vergilian Appendix,¹⁵ some of which, like the *Copa*, were written long after the *Lygdamus*, have the pre-Tibullan form with polysyllabic close. The explanation is that the *Lygdamus* poems have been revised in this respect with the special purpose of fitting them to the elegant corpus in which they stand. The scrupu-

mont and Fletcher; see, e.g., Thorndike, "Shakspeare as a Debtor," in *Columbia University Shaksperian Studies* (New York, 1916), 165-184. Not owing to any poverty of intellect, but to the liveliness and sensitiveness of his genius (L. Müller, *De re metrica*², 79), Ovid is indeed the prince of imitators among the Augustans — surpassing in this respect even Vergil himself — just as Raphael is the chief of adapters and assimilators among the painters of the Renaissance, now 'aping' Viti or Francia or Perugino, now Leonardo or Fra Bartolommeo, now Michelangelo, etc.

¹⁵ Except the *Priapea* and the *Maecenas*; see below, pp. 161 f.

lous artist who apologized for composing the epistle of Sappho, the lyric poetess, in elegiac verse (*Her.* 15, 5), and also for writing the invectives of the *Ibis* in the same metre (*Ib.* 45), and who, in 11, 5, expressly and purposely introduced one or two minor Tibullan refinements into his own metrical schemes, was not likely to overlook propriety in the pentameter closes which strike even the eye. We shall need also probably to bring down the first edition of the *Amores* from 15 B.C. nearer to 12 or 11 B.C.; it was probably later than the *Copa* (15 B.C.), as it was earlier than the *Consolatio*¹⁶ and the *Maecenas* (9 and 8 B.C.). The genius of Ovid matured very slowly, and in respect to powers of abstract thinking and even excellence of composition, was never perhaps full-grown.

II. Authorship of the Vergilian Appendix. Biographical Details. 'Impersonations' of Vergil. Circumstances of Publication

In my former article I gladly accepted the conclusions of Ribbeck, Baehrens, Birt, Marx, Schanz, and Braum, who, on important metrical and stylistic grounds, had identified the author of *Catalepton*, IX with Lygdamus, that is, with the youthful Ovid. In fact, the eminent Hungarian Latinist, Geyza Némethy, whose work was at first unknown to me, had as early as 1909 expressly ascribed this elegy to Ovid, but his views, though cogent, were almost universally set aside and derided. As regards the remaining works of the Appendix, the extensive use of Burman's Index showed me beyond question that the *Ciris*, *Aetna*, and *Culex* were Ovidian productions, but since I was then insufficiently acquainted with the recent literature of the subject, I carefully refrained from expressing any judgment upon the collection as a whole. I have since had an opportunity to study the most important discussions upon the Appendix, and I purpose to give my own conclusions in full in a separate article. It seems desirable,

¹⁶ Ehrengruber, *op. cit.* x, 18, rightly declares the *Consolatio* genuine on metrical grounds.

however, to summarize these views very briefly here. The whole Appendix, as is shown unmistakably by the language and diction, is clearly the work of Ovid, and was attributed by the ancient grammarians to Vergil on wholly insufficient grounds. We may consider first the status of the *Culex*, which, in ancient times, was much the most famous piece of the collection, and was believed to have been addressed by the youthful Vergil to his schoolmate Octavius, the future Octavianus Caesar. Fortunately we possess a sufficiently authoritative and complete dissertation upon the language of the *Culex* by a pupil of Birt's, W. Holtschmidt (*De Culicis carminis sermone*, Marburg, 1913) a very large part of which is devoted to showing in detail the close relationship which exists between the *Culex* and the language of Ovid, a relationship which was first noted in part by Birt himself many years ago (1876). The conclusion reached by Holtschmidt (p. 125) is clear and definite enough: "Non pauca eaque gravissima — indicia declarant pendere Culicis scriptoris sermonem ex Ovidiano." Holtschmidt finally falls, however, into the same technical error that Ehrenguber has committed in the case of the *Panegyric*, and, in accordance no doubt with Birt's suggestions, maintains (p. 126) that the writer of the *Culex* lived *after* Ovid and adopted his language. This last view is, however, quite impossible. For Skutsch had pointed out as early as 1901 (*Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, 125) that Ovid himself was thoroughly well acquainted with the *Culex*, and a still larger number of Ovid's unmistakable imitations (or 'self-loans') have been collected by Plésent in his well-known monograph.¹⁷ The really essential work on the authorship of the *Culex* has therefore already been done, and we may safely pronounce the poem a composition of the youthful Ovid in the certainty that no responsible critic who has access to the two works just named is likely seriously

¹⁷ *Le Culex. Étude sur l'Alexandrinisme latin* (Paris, 1910), 33-35, 119-121. See also P. Jahn's review of Plésent in *Berl. phil. Woch.* XXXI (1911), 1376, and Teuffel-Kroll, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* II⁷, § 230, 2.

to challenge this statement. In ancient times, as is shown by the well-known title prefixed to the *Culex* in the Bembinus and related manuscripts (see Vollmer's edition, *P.L.M.* 1², 45), the Octavius to whom the poem is addressed (vss. 1 and 25) was universally identified with Octavianus Caesar. This view is wholly erroneous, and it has not only been maintained, but has been definitely proved by Ribbeck, *App. Verg.*, pp. 9 and 20,¹⁸ that the real person addressed is Octavius Musa, the gifted historian and poet who is commemorated also in two poems of the *Catalepton* (IV and XI). Ribbeck's conclusions have been adopted by Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 27, and *Tib. Blätter*, 56, by Plessis, *Poésie lat.* 260, and by Rand "Young Vergil's Poetry," *Harv. Stud.* xxx (1919), 116, 137.¹⁹ Ribbeck is mistaken at only a single point. The youth in whose honor the *Culex* was written is not Octavius Musa, the governor of Mantua and member of the older circle of Messalla (*Hor. Serm.* I, 10, 82), but, as Haupt already saw, his son, Octavius Musa the Younger, the patron and contemporary of Ovid. Finally, in my judgment, Skutsch (*op. cit.* 132), is to be earnestly commended for the admirable proof which he has given that the poem itself shows no trace whatever of forgery in Vergil's name.²⁰

¹⁸ Ribbeck's proof is derived from the references to history and 'the Muse' contained in vss. 4, 6, 8, 24, 26-34.

¹⁹ This last is a learned and serious work, much more so, in my judgment, than Vollmer's original article of 1907, and it is based upon comprehensive study. It gives far the best account of the Vergilian Appendix which is accessible in English, and traces also in a most convincing and happy manner *some poet's* early development (not Vergil's, I think). Though usually accepting Vollmer's conclusions, Rand presents not a few correct and helpful views of his own, e.g., the place of the *Aetna* in the Appendix (p. 155), and the clever recovery (as it seems to me) of one of the lost *Epigrammata* (p. 140, n. 8). I only wish that Professor Rand could be induced to transfer a part, at least, of this brilliant sketch to his forthcoming volume on Ovid. I may add that he very kindly sent me a copy of his article at a time when my acquaintance with recent discussions was very incomplete, and I have found it a very delightful and valuable introduction to the whole subject.

²⁰ Skutsch is mistaken, however, in thinking that it was addressed to Octavianus.

I pointed out in my former article (p. 159) that both the *Ciris* and *Catalepton*, ix, which has so many correspondences with it,²¹ fit unmistakably into Ovid's biographical data. For he was twenty-five years old March 20, 18 B.C., and could therefore have become a candidate for the quaestorship in that year.²² We know, however, that he did not do this, but definitely renouncing a public career, repaired to Athens for the study of philosophy (*Trist.* i, 2, 77), attending the lectures of the Garden (*Cir.* 3) as Horace, twenty-five years before, had devoted himself to the teachings of the Academy (*Epist.* ii, 2, 45). This is, however, the precise date which many of the best authorities, such as Baehrens, *P.L.M.* ii, 32, Kreunen, *Proleg. in Cirin* (Utrecht, 1882), 64, Leo, *Herm.* xxxvii (1902), 150, Schanz, ii³, i, § 241, p. 98 and § 320 a, p. 374, and Teuffel-Schwabe, § 230, 2, i, have already selected for the *Ciris* solely on the ground of the relation which the poem bears to the whole *Aeneid*. Moreover, during the last thirty years most authorities, such as Ellis, *A.J.P.* xv (1894), 493, P. Jahn, *op. cit.* 86, Sudhaus, *Herm.* xlii, 476, Knaack, *Rh. Mus.* lvii, 221, Schanz, § 241, p. 98, and Teuffel-Kroll, § 230, 2, i, have held that Ovid knows the *Ciris* and imitates it freely in all his works, especially in his own version of the story of Scylla (*Met.* viii); only a few scholars have sought to make the poem later than Ovid and dependent upon him. The resemblances also between the *Ciris* and the various poems of the *Catalepton* are collected by Sommer, *op. cit.* 44-48, 104-106, Drachmann, *Herm.* xliii (1908), 425, and Baehrens, *P.L.M.* ii, 186 ff. Finally, it has long been recognized that the *Ciris* and *Culex* are most closely bound up with the *Lygdamus*, e.g. by Klee-

²¹ Cf. P. Jahn, *Rh. Mus.* lxiii (1908), 100: "No Latin poem in a restricted space (especially in vss. 47-53) shows proportionately so many parallels to the *Ciris* as *Cat.* ix, which is likewise dedicated to a Messalla." *Cat.* iii also shows many striking parallels, and Jahn concludes (p. 101) that "all three poems evidently proceed from one and the same poet."

²² The ordinary age for holding the quaestorship under the Empire was (twenty-four or) twenty-five; see Furneaux or Nipperdey on Tac. *Ann.* iii, 29, i; Müller's *Handbuch*, iv², 2, § 6, p. 45.

mann, *De libri III carminibus*, 30, and Némethy, (*Lygdami carmina*, p. 30 and notes on 4, 17. 89; 5, 1, etc.; *Rh. Mus.* LXII [1907], 484). Since such valuable results have already been reached, it must be clear that for absolutely conclusive proof of Ovidian authorship, we need only a detailed study of the language of the poem such as Holtschmidt has already given us in the case of the *Culex*; my own extensive collection of material, though sufficient for most practical purposes, is not at present complete enough for publication.

Of the same date as the *Ciris* is the most famous piece of the *Catalepton* (v), in which the boy poet, renouncing rhetoric and love-poetry, turns eagerly and joyously to the pursuit of philosophy. Ovid, writing here *in propria persona*, expresses the same purpose as in *Cir.* 10 f., namely, to 'give the Muses a rest' and to devote himself exclusively to severer studies. In spite of the mention of Siron, the famous Epicurean philosopher and teacher of Vergil, the poem itself bears no relation whatever to Vergil, and *dicta Sironis* (vs. 9) is evidently used in the same sense as *dicta libelli Sironis* (cf. *Aetna*, 538) or *dicta Epicuri* (cf. *Lucr.* III, 12). The Sextus Sabinus mentioned (vs. 7) is perhaps the well-known Sabinus of *Am.* II, 18, 27.

The *Aetna* is a product of the year spent with Macer in Sicily; cf. *Pont.* II, 10, 23: *vidimus Aetnaea caelum splendescere flamma*. The poet who visited the temple of Minerva at Troy (*Fast.* VI, 423), had also stood, as we see from *Aetna*, 588-591, at Sigeum and Rhoeteum beside the tombs of Achilles and of Hector. The works of art mentioned in verses 594-598, which have caused so much discussion, are simply those which Ovid constantly uses for illustration in his other works, and the everlasting reference to Erigone, the 'faultless poem' of Eratosthenes, which he is scarcely able to keep out of any of his productions²³ and introduces even into the *Priapea* (62, 2), turns up of course serenely in the *Aetna* (587). The numerous parallelisms between the *Aetna* and Ovid, also

²³ See the passages in Ehrenguber, *op. cit.* I, 44.

between the *Aetna* and the *Ciris*, *Culex*, *Moretum*, etc., have been collected in part by Alzinger, *Studia in Aetnam collata* (Leipzig, 1896) 50-54, 3-20, and by Sudhaus in his edition (Leipzig, 1898); these include the astounding coincidences with *Ov. Am.* III, 12, 35 and 39, which Sudhaus discusses briefly and inadequately (p. 97).

The *Dirae* also was either composed or translated in Sicily (cf. vs. 9, *Trinacriae . . . gaudia*), and Naeke, *Val. Cato*, 22, 256, C. Fr. Hermann, *Ges. Abh.* 118, and Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* are therefore right in concluding from the text of the poem that the estate from which the owner has been dispossessed was situated on the sea and near high mountains. These references to Sicily and the scenery of the Sicilian coast have usually not been fully understood. The *Moretum* was well known to Ovid, for in *Fast.* IV, 367-371 he practically repeats *Mor.* 99, and the very word *moretum* is quoted by the lexicons only from these two classical passages. The Ovidian character of the language is clearly, though by no means exhaustively, shown by K. v. Reichenbach, *Über die Echtheit des Moretum* (Znaim, 1883), pp. 5, 9-10. The *Copa*, which imitates the last book of Propertius, has been rightly referred to the years 16-15 B.C. by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* XLV (1890), 323, and by Mras, *Wien. Stud.* XXIII (1901), 252. It is probable that it is nearly contemporaneous with the Sulpicia elegies²⁴ and that it precedes the first edition of the *Amores*. The *Rosetum*, like all the other pieces of the collection, imitates the 'singers of Euphorion' (e.g. vs. 45). The grounds on which Naeke formerly attacked it (*op. cit.* 239), seem to me to be completely swept aside. While I still reserve final judgment, I am strongly disposed to recall this exquisite piece without question to the Appendix. The *Priapea* and the *Maecenas* — the latter composed in 8 B.C. — are the latest works contained in the Appendix. They differ from all the rest in certain metrical details, and show — the one usually, the other

²⁴ In these (IV, 2-6), as in the *Copa*, the early Ovidian *schema SDSS* predominates.

invariably — the Tibullan dissyllables in the pentameter close; in general they exhibit no longer a gradual development, but the full perfection of metrical art. It is clear that the Appendix, which was never intended for any except a very limited circulation, was arranged in its present form by Ovid after 8 B.C., and was made to include the *Maecenas*, which for this purpose was torn loose from its companion piece, the *Consolatio ad Liviam*. The statement of Ovid (*Maec.* 9) that he had no personal acquaintance with Maecenas is fully confirmed by the poet's received works, which never mention the Augustan statesman.

I have reserved to the last a brief mention of several poems of the *Catalepton*, which give autobiographical details.²⁵ The sequel of the Lygdamus-Neaera elegies and of Neaera's divorce and remarriage is given in three bitter and virulent pieces (VI, XII, XIII). It would seem that the fair Neaera, whose real name was Atilia, after separation from the poet, fell into the hands of a base spendthrift and debauchee, whose character is attacked with the utmost fury; for the identity of persons and of language here, compare especially XIII, 7, *prostitutae sororis*, and Lygd. 1, 26, *sive sibi coniunx sive futura soror*. The note of sincerity in the Lygdamus poems seems confirmed also when we read (VI, 4 f.): *et mihi . . . gener socerque, perdidistis omnia*. The reference to sickness and a frail physique (XIII, 1 f.) agrees with Ovid's own statements (*e.g.* *Trist.* IV, 10, 37), while the allusion to military service (*ib.* 2 f.) is confirmed by the requirements of the *cursus honorum* and by the Ovidian *Vita* ('*militavit sub M. Varrone*').

There remain for brief mention only the four Vergilian 'impersonations,' 28 verses in all. The first and seventh poems are addressed to Tucca and Varius and cause us to wonder mildly that the jocose love affairs which they describe should have interested so deeply Vergil's executors and the editors

²⁵ I purpose myself, at an early date, to publish a study of the language of at least the chief parts of the *Catalepton*.

of the *Aeneid*. The eighth speaks of the possibility of taking refuge (along with 'dad') in the villa of Siron, while the fourteenth²⁶ is a pleading prayer to Venus that the poet might be permitted to finish the *Aeneid* (which the actual writer knows perfectly well that he never finished). When we reflect that the *Catalepton* contains a direct parody of Catullus (x), consisting of 20 lines, and a lampoon of 40 lines (xiii) in the manner of Horace's *Epodes*, and further that the Tibullan Corpus contains three 'impersonations' of Tibullus, amounting in all to 226 lines — not to mention 214 lines of Sulpicia elegies, spoken by Sulpicia and the poet alternately, and 40 lines of letters of a most personal and intimate kind written by Sulpicia herself (!) — when, I repeat, we consider all these amazingly similar happenings and occasionally let our minds dwell too upon the twenty-one Epistles of the Heroines, we surely cannot be greatly at a loss how to interpret these four playful and harmless little effusions. There can be no doubt that the lost *Epigrammata* also contained a few Vergilian impersonations; one of these is probably still preserved in the shape of the series of epigrams on Ballista contained in the life of Vergil by Phocas (*Anth. Lat.* 671, 71-72. 76-83).

It is scarcely necessary for me to discuss the concluding epigram of the *Catalepton* (*Vate Syracosio*, etc.) which expressly asserts Vergilian authorship for some unnamed collection of verse, but whether this collection is the *Catalepton* roll alone,²⁷ or the whole Appendix in late codex form, it is impossible to say. Commentators are also greatly in doubt whether to hold that the epigram was added by the editor (Ellis, Birt), or by some late grammarian (Vollmer, Sommer). The problem is insoluble.

It is clear that we actually have in the present Appendix

²⁶ Almost invariably rejected by critics according to Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 346, e.g., by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* xxxviii, 523 f., and by Sommer, *op. cit.* 68 f.

²⁷ In this first case the epigram may have been composed either (a) by Ovid himself in a spirit of mischief or (b) by some grammarian. We cannot tell.

the series of youthful works which Ovid assures us in the *Tristia* he had suppressed and destroyed, because he regarded them as 'faulty'; cf. *Trist.* IV, 10, 61 f.:

Multa quidem scripsi, sed quae vitiosa putavi,
Emendaturis ignibus ipse dedi.²⁸

Cf. also *ib.* I, 7, 15: haec (*i.e.*, *Metamorphoses*) ego discedens, *sicut bene multa meorum*, | ipse mea posui maestus in igne manu. These statements cannot refer to his poems contributed to the Tibullan Corpus, which he knew would be preserved and read as long as the genuine works of Tibullus himself, but only to the pieces of the Vergilian Appendix. It is evident, however, that as in the case of the *Metamorphoses*, which he also sought to destroy, there were in this case too several additional copies in existence, and these latter, contrary to the poet's first intention, were preserved either in the principal booksellers' shops or in the archives of the great patrons. These transcripts, however, did not belong to a definite and permanent edition, but only to a tentative one, and they were issued anonymously.

The studies of Birt and Sommer upon the *Catalepton*, valuable as they are, contain also very grave mistakes; for they erroneously attribute many of these pieces to Vergil himself.²⁹ Yet both Birt and Sommer exercise discrimination and restraint and they both show a genuine regard for the work of their predecessors in the same field. A similar statement cannot be made, in my judgment, respecting Vollmer's article in the *Sitzungsberichte* already quoted above, which not only ascribes to Vergil the whole *Catalepton*, but all the other parts of the Appendix accepted by Donatus and Servius. Vollmer's method appears to me wholly to lack the critical faculty, and his article, in its total rejection of internal evidence and its almost total neglect of the work of

²⁸ "He wrote and destroyed many verses before he published anything," says S. G. Owen, *Ency. Brit*¹¹. xx, 386.

²⁹ Birt, *Catalepton*, 7, 95 f., rejects only *Cat.* ix; Sommer, *op. cit.* 31 ff., rejects only ix, xiii, xiv.

nearly all students of the Appendix, seems a most remarkable production to proceed from a learned scholar of the twentieth century.³⁰ Vollmer gives a thoroughly good account of the ancient and textual testimony — to which alone he attaches any value — and in his view (*op. cit.* 350) the evidence is sufficient to show that a corpus of Vergil's minor works was published immediately after his death. We do not share this view, yet we also recognize something unusual and remarkable in the text tradition, as it has been described by Vollmer and others. The actual circumstances of publication cannot be precisely known, but we may conjecture them to have been somewhat as follows. A carefully guarded and highly prized manuscript, without the name of its author, was preserved in the book-boxes of one of the chief publishers or — more probably — in the archives of one of the great literary patrons — Cotta, Messalinus, or Fabius Maximus. The rolls may have constituted an edition *de luxe*, or the place of their deposit may have indicated the high value of the manuscript; in any case it is likely that the work exhibited some mark of special honor, though it bore no title. The grammarians of the age of Tiberius opened these rolls with the most favorable prepossessions, recognizing from the first that they had in their possession the works of one of the chief Augustans, but not knowing whether the real author was Vergil, Varius, Valgius, Horace, Gallus, Propertius, or Ovid. When they reached, however, the four (or as they thought, the five) 'impersonations' of Vergil contained in the *Catalepton* (I, v, VII, VIII, XIV), their doubts were at an end and they believed that they held in their hands the juvenile poems of Vergil himself. It cannot be asserted definitely that they found the concluding epigram expressly asserting Vergilian authorship, but even this is perhaps possible. Elated with their discovery, they next examined more

³⁰ A whole section devoted to Vollmer's method has been omitted here for lack of space, and will be published elsewhere. It discusses also more fully the 'New Vergil' and the 'Cecropian Garden at Naples (?).'

carefully the remaining rolls, and finding one addressed to 'worshipful Octavius,' 'the holy lad' (*Cul.* 25 f.), they cried out joyously — if we may employ the grandiloquent language of the later Carolingian editor — that they had found the youthful productions of "the wisest of poets, the fellow-disciple of Octavianus Caesar, the emperor of the world." Thus the fortune of the whole collection was definitely made, and the *Culex*, which was believed to show the close friendship existing between Vergil and the youthful Octavian, naturally remained the most famous piece of the entire Appendix. The *Aetna* was probably extant in a separate edition, which was either anonymous or published in the name of its true author, and it was therefore never fully accepted as Vergilian.

III. Extent of the Original Appendix. Servius' 'Seven Rolls.' The *Epigrammata*. The Great *Priapea*

The view which we take of the original form of the Appendix has already been clearly implied in the preceding discussion, but may be stated here more fully at a few points. Servius (*Vitae Verg.* p. 69 Brummer), after giving the distich on Ballista, tells us that Vergil wrote also seven or eight 'books' (scripsit septem sive octo libros): *Ciris*, *Aetna*, *Culex*, *Priapeia*, *Catalecton* (*sic*), *Epigrammata*, *Copa*, *Dirae*. The same works are named (though in a different order) by Donatus (*ib.* 4), except that he mentions the *Aetna* as disputed and omits entirely the *Copa*. It is generally agreed today (Vollmer, *op. cit.* 342; Birt, *op. cit.* 8) that at the time of first publication these juvenile works were copied off — either entirely or for the most part — on separate papyrus rolls, which gave the title of each work, and the whole collection was preserved in a single *capsa*. Servius' account is derived from Suetonius, and it is evidently to this form of publication that Suetonius originally referred; we have therefore the problem of determining how the seven rolls were probably constituted. Later, after the parchment book had been introduced, the well-

known catalogue of the Murbach library, compiled about 850, makes mention of a Vergilian codex, now lost, which contained *Dirae*, *Culex*, *Aetna*, *Copa*, *Maecenas*, *Ciris*, *Catalepion* (*sic*), *Priapeia*, *Moretum*, but from which the *Epigrammata* had already disappeared. Finally, after the full Appendix had broken up into several parts, a special collection, the so-called *Iuvenalis ludi libellus*,³¹ was brought together in Carolingian times, containing *Versus Ovidii Nasonis*, *Culex*, *Dirae*, *Copa*, the two Ausonian pieces, *Est et non* and *Vir bonus*, *Rosetum*, *Moretum*, often also *Versus Octaviani Augusti* (*Ergone supremis*, etc.),³² and *Carmen tetrasticon Ovidii Nasonis*. The Bruxellensis has also preserved the single iambic Priapeum (sometimes attributed to Tibullus), *Quid hoc novi est*, and the Cuiacianus of Tibullus apparently had, with ascription to Vergil (Schanz, *op. cit.* §278, p. 220), the short Priapeum in three distichs, *Vilicus aerari quondam*.

By no means all of the *Epigrammata* have been permanently lost, but some have been preserved in the anthology of the codex Salmasianus, and less completely also in the enlarged form of the Donatus *Vita* and in Parisini 8069, 8093, 8071, etc.³³ These are the well-known verselets *Nocte pluit tota*, *Hos ego versiculos*, *Pars tibi Nise datur*, *Arretine calix*, *Monte sub hoc lapidum*, *Si quotiens peccant*, etc. (*Anth. Lat.* 256–263). Possibly we should add to these such pieces also as *Anth.*

³¹ Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1908, 1–82; Sommer, *op. cit.* 7; Baehrens, *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* CXI (1875), 137 ff.

³² Whether this famous ‘impersonation’ of Augustus, in which he is represented as forbidding the destruction of the *Aeneid* (*Anth. Lat.* 645), at least in the much simpler and better version in which the last twelve lines have been preserved in the admirable Vossianus fol. 111 (*Nescio quid fugiente*, *Anth. Lat.* 655, and II, p. 147), may possibly also have belonged to the Appendix from the first, is a question which I shall not here discuss and which probably cannot be determined. Baehrens, *op. cit.* 138, gives good grounds for regarding the verses as a very late addition.

³³ This is the view held — correctly, as I think — by Naeke, *op. cit.* 226, 235; Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 3; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 36; Riese, *Anth. Lat.* 1¹ (1869), xxix; L. Müller, *Praef. Priap.* xli (in his edition of Catullus); Leo, *Culex*, p. 18. Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 340, is wrong in thinking that none have been preserved.

Lat. 663, 674^a (*Maeonium quisquis*), 778, 812 (*Parce puer*), 813 (*Iuppiter in caelis*), and the like.³⁴ In no sense then do we accept the forced and unnatural explanation of the *Epigrammata* as the same as the *Catalepton* that has been urged in recent years, but we wish a large collection of verselets that will themselves constitute a roll, and upon which the authors of the Vergilian *Vitae* and the compilers of the Salmasian codex may have freely drawn. Specifically we have overwhelming proof for including among the *Epigrammata* verses referring evidently to another part of the Appendix,³⁵ the epigram afterwards unwittingly repeated by its author in *Trist.* II, 33 f.,³⁶ probably the two epigrams whose Ovidian parallels were long ago pointed out by Comparetti and Riese,³⁷ and finally the elegiac quatrain preserved only in inferior manuscripts³⁸ but cleverly shown by Rand, *op. cit.* 141, to be taken from 'a page that came after the epilogue to the *Catalepton*,' i.e., from a page of the *Epigrammata*.

We are now prepared to indicate the original form of the Appendix and to reconstitute the seven books named by Servius. We may first mention, however, a fatal error which has long injuriously affected the criticism of the collection. Scholars have usually tended strongly to hold that the poems which are not expressly mentioned by Suetonius (that is, by

³⁴ Cf. Naeke, *op. cit.* 236. Possibly also *Mantua me genuit, Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena*.

³⁵ No. 258: Pars tibi, Nise, datur Bacchi, pars deinde negatur: | Esse potes liber, non potes esse pater, 'You can be free as a bird of air, but you are no longer a father.' The piece has most Ovid-like punning, and though Nisus, through his transformation into a bird, loses his daughter, he becomes of course 'free'; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 116: *liber captivos avis ferae consimilis est*. Cf. also *Cir.* 191 f.: *Nise pater . . . tu quoque avis moriere*; *Met.* VIII, 126: *exige poenas, Nise pater*; *ib.* 231 and *A. A.* II, 93: *At pater infelix, nec iam pater, 'Icare,' dixit*.

³⁶ No. 262: Si quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat | Iuppiter, exiguo tempore inermis erit.

³⁷ On *Maeonium quisquis* (674^a), see Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, Eng. trans., p. 153, n. 57; on *Iuppiter in caelis* (813), see Riese, *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* 1869, p. 282.

³⁸ *Cat.* XIII^a (Ellis), xvi (Birt); cf. Sommer, p. 5.

Donatus and Servius) did not then form part of the Appendix, but were added at a later time by mistake and by a process of slow accretion to the original nucleus.³⁹ This current view, which finds no support whatever in the text tradition, seems to me wholly erroneous, and it greatly obscures the true nature of the Appendix. On the contrary, it is probable that, with the exception of the loss of the *Epigrammata* and the addition of the two Ausonian pieces (*Est et non, Vir bonus*), the collection exists today⁴⁰ in nearly the same state as when it was first published in the age of Tiberius. Servius evidently could not mention as Vergilian the *Maecenas*, which was written eleven years after Vergil's death and which he doubtless supposed to be a later addition.⁴¹ Also the *Copa* is not mentioned by Donatus, and the *Moretum* and *Rosetum* are mentioned neither by Donatus nor Servius for the reason, in my judgment, that the three or four smaller pieces were written together on one roll, which bore the title of its first piece, the *Dirae*.⁴² The seven Vergilian 'books' of Servius, with the number of verses in each, were then probably as follows: (1) *Culex* (414); (2) *Dirae, Copa, Moretum, Rosetum* (393);⁴³

³⁹ Thus Vollmer, *op. cit.* 341, 356, holds that the *Moretum, Lydia, Aetna*, and *Maecenas* were added after Vergil's death, yet in the first century A.D., but that they do not appear in Suetonius' list, because they first crept into a private copy(!).

⁴⁰ For example, following the procedure of the Renaissance editors and assembling all the minor works which reputable manuscripts attribute to Vergil, Vollmer has the full Appendix, with the exception of (1) the *Priapea*, (2) the *Epigrammata* which have been preserved, (3) the *Rosetum*.

⁴¹ The *Maecenas* is not so much a spurious Vergilian as a genuine Ovidian work. As is well known, it professes to be by the same author as the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which is also genuine.

⁴² Therefore, strictly speaking, Servius is in error, when in his list he mentions both the *Dirae* and the *Copa*, and it is probably owing to this error that he mentions 'seven or eight' books; cf. Schanz § 235, p. 85. It would be possible also to hold that the *Moretum* and *Copa*, like the *Aetna*, were in circulation in other editions, perhaps bearing the name of their true author, and therefore they could not be accepted by Suetonius as Vergilian, but we greatly prefer the view given above.

⁴³ The iambic *Priapeum, Quid hoc novi est* (45), may have stood either in the *Dirae* roll, or in the *Epigrammata*, or at the end of the great *Priapea*.

(3) *Ciris* (541); (4) *Aetna* (641); (5) *Catalepton* (286); (6) *Epigrammata* (uncertain); (7) *Priapea* (565). The *Maece-nas* may either have been added to one of the other rolls (e.g. the *Catalepton*), or it may have formed an eighth 'book'; the former is more likely.

We reach at last the great *Priapea*,⁴⁴ one of the seven main divisions of the Appendix, which is attested as such by Donatus, by Servius, and by the ninth century Murbach catalogue, and which, as is well known, is ascribed in nearly all the manuscripts to Vergil,⁴⁵ and receives its proper place in nearly all the early editions of the Vergilian opuscula. It might be supposed therefore that, except for investigating its language and meter, our task was finished. This is far, however, from being actually the case. For brilliant and elegant as the *Priapea* is in so many respects, it is yet, owing to its licentious character, the one disreputable member, the one 'black sheep' of the Appendix family, and its room has usually been much more desired than its company. Its text has had therefore a checkered and eventful history, since

⁴⁴ Wernicke's treatise (*Priapeia*, I, Thorn, 1853) has not been accessible to me any more than it was to Buecheler, nor have I been able to procure Calì, *Studi su i Priapea*, Catania, 1894. With these exceptions, I have used all the important literature, including of course the edition (with *notae variorum*) by P. Burman in his *Anth. Lat.*, lib. VI, Amsterdam, 1773, and the catalogue of editions of Vergil in Naëke, *op. cit.* 379-422.

⁴⁵ Cf. L. Müller, *Praef. Priap.* XLIV: Longissime a vero aberrarunt, qui statuerent, ad tria tantum Priapea . . . pertinere Donati testimonium, quippe et codicum plerique omnes constanter totam syllogem tribuunt Maroni; Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* XVIII (1863), 382: Hunc Priapeorum librum ideo codices P. Vergilio Maroni adtribuunt quod catalectis Vergilianis cohaerebat antiquitus. itaque in vita Vergilii Donatus 'catalecton et priapia' inter opera illius poetica numeravit; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 55 f.: codices novicii saec. xv plerumque praescribunt 'P. Virgilii Maronis Priapeia' similiae. Alone of all the editors, Baehrens (*P.L.M.* I, 54; II, 33; *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* CXI, 140, n. 5) wholly minimizes the value of the ascription to Vergil in the manuscripts. He does this on the wholly insufficient ground that the date which he assumes for the publication of the Appendix in the age of Claudius conflicts with the elder Seneca's quotation from the *Priapea*. Teuffel (§ 254, 5) and Schanz (§ 320) do not even mention the usual ascription, but only the corrected title in Laur. 33. 31, *Diversorum auctorum Priapeia*!

not unnaturally the ascription of so considerable a body of ribald poems to Vergil aroused in some of the medieval copyists and still more in the great Renaissance scholars an invincible repugnance. Like the *Aetna*, the *Ciris*, and the *Catalepton*, but for a very different reason,⁴⁶ it has been torn loose from the principal part of the Appendix in nearly all manuscripts.⁴⁷ One or two manuscripts, such as the well-known Laur. 33, 31 (saec. xiv), give a corrected title *Diversorum auctorum Priapeia*, while a few simply erase the Vergilian ascription either in whole or in part (Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 57; Naeke, 240). From such causes as these many erroneous views have arisen among scholars respecting the *Priapea*; all of them, however, without exception, are such as admit of being easily dissipated by a historical review.

We may first dispose of an erroneous view which is comparatively recent, but which has been widely held in certain quarters. For four hundred years editors of Vergil apparently did not question that the great *Priapea* is the collection ascribed by Donatus and Servius to Vergil, though they almost invariably held that the ascription was a wholly mistaken one. This is still the view of Naeke, *op. cit.* (1847) 240 f., who excludes the *Priapea* — like the *Aetna*, the *Ciris*, and the '*Catalecta*' — from the *Iuvenalis ludi libellus*, but not from the Appendix.⁴⁸ After Naeke's time, however, a new explanation was brought forward, especially favored perhaps by Baehrens and by Sabbadini. This view, which is well set forth by Sommer, *op. cit.* 35, and by Birt, *op. cit.* 3, professes to proceed from Donatus' statement (Brummer, p. 4):

⁴⁶ 'Non recepta . . . propter obscenitatem' (Naeke, *op. cit.* 225).

⁴⁷ Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 8, Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 30, and Naeke, *op. cit.* 225, 337, 345, mention three fifteenth century manuscripts in which the *Priapea* is joined to the other opuscula, namely, to Vossianus L. O. 81, Parisinus 8205, and Mediceus plut. xxxiii, 31. The *Aetna* also joins the other works only in a few manuscripts and joins the *Libellus* only in two.

⁴⁸ At the same time he well says: "Nihil in Priapeiis Vergilianum, nedum Catullianum; aetatem Ovidii, vel supparem Ovidio, concedo . . . plerisque carminibus."

Deinde (fecit) Catalecton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, etc. It assumes, however, that Suetonius originally wrote *Catalepton (et Priapea et Epigrammata)*⁴⁹ and that Donatus has made a mistake in interpreting him. Likewise Servius has made a mistake in naming seven rolls and in changing the order freely thus: septem sive octo libros . . . Priapeia Catalecton Epigrammata. (Likewise, we may add, the Murbach catalogue has made a mistake in its order, Catalepton Priapeia, for the three poems on Priapus in the *Catalepton* stand first, not last.) By thus assuming in a most forced and unnatural manner that Donatus' *et* has the meaning of *id est* or *scilicet*, sorely harassed and perplexed editors have sought to show that the terms *Priapea* and *Epigrammata* in the ancient account indicate only subdivisions or component parts of the *Catalepton* and have no independent meaning whatsoever. Hence, since the *Catalepton* happens to begin with three poems — of forty-six lines in all — relating to Priapus, which form of course a part of the *Catalepton* roll and are included under the *Catalepton* title, the proposal is made to remove the three poems in question from the *Catalepton*, to introduce a new and special title of '*Priapea*,' and so to obviate all need of recognizing the disreputable member of the collection, the great *Priapea*.

In practice, however, the editors of the text, in view of the lack of the least vestige of manuscript authority for such a change, proceed rather cautiously. Thus Ribbeck continues to include the three Priapean poems under the '*Catalecta*,' Ellis creates a hybrid title '*Catalepton (Priapea)*,' whatever this may mean, and writing in his preface (p. ix) *Ciris Priapea Catalepton* instead of the correct *Ciris Catalepton*, he conscientiously adds an expression of doubt in a footnote.⁵⁰ Voll-

⁴⁹ Certainly Ribbeck's guess (*App. Verg.* 3) is just as good or even better than this, namely, that Donatus 'perhaps' meant 'catalecton libros tres, priapea scilicet et epigrammata et diras.'

⁵⁰ "Si modo tria illa carmina ad Priapum praefixa Cataleptis aut eadem aut inter ea quae Servio ac Donato Priapeorum nomine innotuerant." Schanz also is cautious here (§ 235, p. 85): "Perhaps we may go a step further and

mer rashly introduces the new titles '⟨*Priapea*⟩' and '⟨*Catalepton*⟩,' and arbitrarily assumes in his edition (pp. 127 and 130) that the title *Catalepton*, originally standing before the supposed second part of the collection, 'casu migravit ante *Priapea*'; Baehrens also (*P.L.M.* II, 58) has the title '*Priapea*.' Birt has only the title *Catalepton* and says expressly (p. 2): "We have no reason and no right to transpose the title *Catalepton* which precedes the (three) *Priapea* and to place it, as Ellis does, after III^a." As we read further, however, we find that he holds (contrary to Donatus, Servius, and the Murbach catalogue) that there never was in the Appendix any separate heading, title, or book such as *Priapea*. He had defended the title; he should have defended both the title and the fact which is implied in the title. We are indebted to Birt, however, for the clear settlement of one important question. L. Müller (*op. cit.* XLIV ff.) had correctly maintained that the great *Priapea* was a part of the Appendix, but he had also supposed that our three separate poems did not originally stand in the manuscripts of the Appendix at the head of the *Catalepton*, but at the very end of the *Priapea*, thus forming nos. 83-85 of the complete collection. Birt, *op. cit.* 45 f., and Sommer, *op. cit.* 96, have shown, however, that the last assumption is an impossible one. For the three *Priapean* poems of the *Catalepton* follow the Catullan metric and very freely allow the basis or first foot of the Glyconic and the Pherecratic to consist of a trochee, while the Phalaeceans of the great *Priapea* (with the single exception of *dicans*, 4, 2) rigorously observe the Horatian rule that the basis shall always be a spondee. It is evident therefore that the three poems in question were composed several years in advance of the great *Priapea* and have belonged from the first to the *Catalepton*.

We return to the history of the collection. It is well known that the younger Pliny, *Ep.* v, 3, 2 ff., speaks of Vergil as being, include the *Priapea* under the *Catalepton*." Teuffel-Schwabe and Teuffel-Kroll (§ 230, 5, 2), however, are rash in the extreme.

in a præëminent degree, a writer of unchaste verses: *Facio nonnumquam versiculos severos parum . . . inter quos (sc. auctores) vel præcipue numerandus est P. Vergilius, Cornelius Nepos, etc.* We cannot doubt therefore that at the date when this letter was written (105 A.D.) not merely the two objectionable poems of the *Catalepton* (II^a, XIII), but also the whole licentious corpus of the *Priapea* lay before him, and was accepted by him as Vergilian, just as shortly before the *Culex* had been accepted by Lucan, Statius, and Martial. In the ninth century also, as is shown by the Murbach catalogue, the *Priapea* was still a part of the Appendix. Shortly afterwards, the Appendix was broken up, as we know, into many different parts.⁵¹ On account of its ribald character, the *Priapea* was now usually separated from all the other pieces, and was less frequently copied by the monks than any other part, hence all our manuscripts are very late; in a few cases also, as in Laur. 33, 31, the title was corrected to *Diversorum auctorum Priapea* or some similar designation.

The attitude of the Renaissance scholars towards the *Priapea* may best be illustrated from the procedure adopted by Giovanni Andrea, the brilliant editor of the *princeps* (1469). As Naeke has shown (p. 379), it was originally his intention to include the *Priapea* in the edition as a whole, and he wrote therefore in the dedicatory epistle as follows: *Priapeiam illam quidem . . . non inelegantem esse fateor. Sed an optimi et modestissimi sit Vatis, quoniam nonnulli ambi-gunt, nequaquam asseruerim.* At the last moment, however, it was thought best to include the indecorous collection in only a part of the copies issued, and to omit it from another part. A similar compromise was effected in the title adopted, namely, *Lusus poetarum in Priapum*. Subsequent editions

⁵¹ At least six, namely (1) the *Libellus*, (2) *Aetna*, (3) *Moretum*, (4) *Ciris* and *Catalepton*, (5) *Maecenas*, (6) *Priapea*. For the sake of brevity it is often said (e.g., by Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 24; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 6; Ellis, *Praef.* ix; Sommer, *Cat.* 4) that the Appendix broke up into two (main) parts, but this statement is of course not wholly accurate; cf. Vollmer, *P.L.M.* I², 4: "collectio in varias partes discerpta est."

of the fifteenth century include the *Priapea*, but usually without ascription, *i.e.*, they give the title simply as *Priapea*.⁵² The Aldine edition of the *Carmina Minora* of 1517 includes the *Priapea*, but under the vulgate title *Diversorum veterum poetarum in Priapum lusus*. The Preface of Burman (*Anth. Lat.* II, 475-478) shows clearly how purely conventional and traditional this title is. The Renaissance scholars were naturally greatly averse to attributing the whole collection to Vergil, but they readily acquiesced in the ascription *diversorum auctorum (poetarum)*, with the purpose (as they declared) that the more innocent poems might be referred to Vergil, the remainder to Tibullus, Ovid, Petronius, and Martial.⁵³

A curious result of the compromise that, for very practical reasons, was effected in the Renaissance four centuries ago, has come down to our own times. For even the learned editors, like Buecheler and L. Müller, whose judgments upon the *Priapea* are usually so just, are strangely misled at this point by conventions and traditions of long standing. Thus Müller, *op. cit.* XLIV, declares that "even a child can recognize that the *Priapea* contain the work of many authors," and a similar opinion is expressed by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* XVIII, 383. Hence all modern critics speak constantly of the elegant connoisseur who 'compiled,' 'collected' or 'copied off' these poems from the walls of the shrines of Priapus.⁵⁴ The actual

⁵² Veneta Achat. (1473) and Romana (1473) have, however, *P.V.M. Priapea*, (Naeke, 387 f.), while Ascensiana I (1500) and Virgilius Aldinus (1501) exclude both the *Priapea* and the '*Catalecta*' (Naeke, 411).

⁵³ For similar reasons they attribute the two longer *Priapea* of the *Catalepton* (nos. 84 and 85 Müller) to Catullus. It was Scaliger who finally protested most earnestly against attributing the *Priapea* to Vergil (Burman, p. 478).

⁵⁴ Cf. Buecheler, p. 382, 'qui collegit'; Müller, p. XIII, 'collegit *Priapea*'; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 54, 'parietibus sacelli Priapo dedicati . . . ea collegit lepidus quidam'; Teuffel-Schwabe, § 25, 4, 5, 'poems which the editor had gleaned (Teuffel-Kroll, 'zusammengelesen hatte') from literature (3 is from Ovid), and especially from the walls of the shrines of Priapus, and himself revised'; Carter, *Elegiac Poets*, XLIV, 'made a collection of the poems, copying them from the walls, etc.'

language of the second preface (2, 9 ff.) is, however, something quite different :

Ergo, quidquid id est, quod otiosus
Templi parietibus tui *notavi*,
In partem accipias bonam, rogamus,

'I beg you humbly, Priapus, to excuse these verses that in my idle hours I have scribbled upon the walls of your temple.'⁵⁵ Actually of course we know that our poet wrote the *Priapea*, which is full of recondite literary allusions, in his study, with many volumes of Homer (68), Callimachus (12, 3; 16, 5), Eratosthenes (62, 2), Leonidas (24), Elephantis (4, 2), Philaenis (63, 17) and other learned authors gathered about him, but he is clever enough to use the custom of writing jocose verses upon the walls of Priapus' shrine as a pretext or excuse for his indecorous volume. The somewhat transparent literary device which he employs consists then in saying that he has just accidentally scribbled his own light verses at random on the plaster walls—transferring them of course later to his tablets with the help of an exceptionally good memory; there is no thought or faintest suggestion, however, that he has ever scribbled off, copied off, or collected the verses of any other person or persons whatsoever.

In the foregoing discussion we have determined the relation of the *Priapea* to the Vergilian Appendix, which we consider of fundamental and vital importance, but which has been neglected in all studies of the Appendix made subsequent to L. Müller's edition of the *Priapea* (Leipzig, 1870). We have shown also, contrary to the wholly unwarranted assumptions which most editors and scholars have made ever since the curious but necessary compromise effected in the early Renaissance, that the second preface implies not diversity but unity of

⁵⁵ *Notavi* is not 'collected from,' 'copied off from,' but 'marked, scratched, written (*scripsi*),' just as in the *Praefatio* to the metrical arguments, vs. 5: *argumenta quidem librorum prima notavi*, and often elsewhere in Ovid, as *Her.* I, 62; III, 2; V, 22; *Met.* IX, 523 f. etc. Cf. Burman *ad loc.*: '*notare hic est inscribere*,' and Rand, *op. cit.* 129: 'They are scribbled on the walls of the god's rustic shrine (2, 9 f.)'

authorship for the entire *Priapea*. If, however, there is a single author for these poems, there can be no question of his identity. For the elder Seneca, *Contr.* I, 2, 22, tells us that, at a certain *controversia* or declamation at which he was present in the schools of rhetoric, one of the speakers gave a ribald turn to the argument. Instantly the distinguished orator and poet Mamercus Scaurus,⁵⁶ who was as witty as he was dissolute, completely disconcerted him by quoting *Ovidianum illud*, '*inepta loci*.' The reference is to *Priap.* 3, 7 f.: Quod virgo prima cupido dat nocte marito, | dum timet alterius volnus inepta loci. I may add that the natural assumption is that Seneca's attestation of Ovidian authorship applies to the whole book. For attestation is not required for each single piece any more than it would be necessary for each single poem in Book I of Horace's *Odes*, and Naeké, *op. cit.* 221, is quite right in insisting earnestly that when Quintilian, VIII, 3, 28, accepted one poem (II^b) of the *Catalepton* as Vergilian, he accepted all.⁵⁷

The astounding language of the two prefaces, the diction and *schemata* of all the poems, the unity of the refined metrical art revealed by innumerable details confirm at every point the conclusions which we have just reached through our study of the Appendix. We reserve, however, the treatment of the two prefaces and of the metrical art for a brief article to be published elsewhere.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ On Scaurus, see Teuffel, § 276, 2; he was driven by Tiberius to suicide in 34 A.D. (Tac. *Ann.* VI, 29). The *controversia* mentioned apparently took place in the last ten or fifteen years of Augustus' reign. Scaurus was accustomed to quote Ovid very frequently and apparently knew his works almost by heart (*Contr.* IX, 5, 17); in view of the character of his life and his high nobility, it is possible that he was a friend and dissolute associate of Cotta. He may have known the *Priapea* from oral recitation, or from a separate edition, or even — it must be freely admitted — from a complete edition of the Appendix, which in that case was never wholly suppressed. We can only conclude from the passage in question that the real author of the *Priapea* was known both to Scaurus under Augustus and to Seneca under Tiberius.

⁵⁷ Vollmer also (*Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 344, n. 1) accepts this principle and quotes Naeké's statement of it with warm approval.

⁵⁸ Probably in *Classical Philology*. The article is already completed.